

A
R E P L Y

T O

Mr. *Douglass's* Short Account
of the State of MIDWIFERY in
London and Westminster.

W H E R E I N

Histrifling and malicious Cavils are answer'd,
his Interestedness and Disingenuity impar-
tially represented, and the Practice of
Physick, but particularly the Character
of the late Dr. CHAMBERLEN, vindicated
from his indecent and unjust Aspersions.

By EDMUND CHAPMAN,
Surgeon and Man-Midwife, in *Orange-Street*,
near *Red Lion-Square*.

Invidiosus sibi semper Molestus.

L O N D O N :

Printed for T. COOPER, at the *Globe* in *Pater-Noster-Row*;
and Sold by JOHN BRINDLEY, at the *King's Arms* in
New Bond-street; JOHN CLARKE, under the *Royal Ex-*
change; and CHARLES CORBETT, at *Addison's Head*
over-against St. *Dunstan's Church* in *Fleetstreet*. 1737.
(Price One Shilling.)

REPLY

TO

THE EDITOR OF THE
LONDON GAZETTE

SIR,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 14th inst. in relation to the above subject, and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration.

I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
J. H. DODGE

LONDON

Printed by J. H. DODGE, at the
Office of the London Gazette, No. 1, St. Martin's Lane, London, W.C.

1884



REPLY

TO

Mr. *Douglass's* Short Account
of *Midwifery*, &c.



R. Douglass his short Account
of the State of *Midwifery* in
London and *Westminster*, in
which he has endeavoured to
cast a Cloud of Reproach over
the Characters of those that practise this
noble and necessary Branch of *Physick*, but
particularly my own, need not have remain-
ed so long unanswered, could I have per-
suaded myself it had deserved it.

A 2

Malicious

L.H.H.

Malicious Productions are generally best despised ; but lest *Silence* should be look'd upon as an Argument of Guilt, as in these Cases by the Weak it sometimes is, and Mr. *Douglass* should be encourag'd to deal farther in *Calumny* and *Aspersion*, I am at length induced to give him a Reply, which I shall at once enter upon, without farther Preface or Preamble.

To begin then with his *Dedication* : The only Motives of Dedications seem to be, either to submit one's Performance to a proper *Judge*, to make some small return of *Gratitude* for Benefits receiv'd ; or else to *curry Favour*. Now, as the Honourable and worthy Lady, to whom Mr. *Douglass* has dedicated his Book, cannot possibly be supposed to be a *Judge* of its Merit ; and, in all probability, never confer'd the least *Favour* upon the *Author*, the *Reader* cannot well be mistaken in conjecturing what was Mr. *Douglass's* true *Drift* in his *Dedication*.

His *Quibble*, how a *Man* can be a *Wife*, without being an *Hermaphrodite* ? Whether a *Maid* may not be taught the Art of delivering Women, and yet be no *Wife* ? That *Widows* lay Women, and yet are not *Wives*, and his Query about *Girl-Midwives*, are too low and trifling to deserve a serious

a serious Answer, and seem rather to be the product of a pert *Sufficiency*, than a sound *Judgment*. They are rather Indications of one who was willing to cut himself out Work for criticising at all Events, than of a cool and sober Reasoner.

In answer to his, I shall beg leave to put the following *Queries*.

1. If the Term *Midwifery* is properly applied to the Practice of that Art, when in the Hands of either Sex, why may not either Man or Woman so practising, be in Propriety of Speech call'd a *Midwife*?
 2. Is not the Word *Midwifery* rather expressive of Practice on a *Wife*, who only is presum'd to want the Assistance of a Man or Woman in the present Case, than of the Sex of the Person practising?
 3. On receding from the common Form and Custom of Speech in this Case, is not the supposed Absurdity exchange'd for *Unintelligibility*? That is, what Idea can be fix'd to, what Etymology found for the new Term *Midman* and *Midwoman*?
- The Word *Midman*, he owns himself, is not an over-neat Expression, and it certainly

tainly carries (to use his own Words) more Nonsense in the very Front of it, than the Term he has endeavoured to explode. Custom or Use hath always the Effect of a Law ;

Quem penes arbitrium est & jus & norma loquendi.

Hor.

And what is Language but a customary and receiv'd use of Words? So that we may see the Term *Man-Midwife* may be defended, both from Custom and Propriety, and will doubtless be in use long after Mr. *Douglafs* himself shall be forgotten.

In Page 3. Mr. *Douglafs* falls very foul on the Character of the celebrated Dr. *Chamberlen*, representing him as puzzling and confounding the Art he profess'd, to the Advantage of most of the greatest Families in this Kingdom, rather than improving it; and very indecently, and unjustly too, brands him as an artful and insinuating Translator. He says, he rather darkens, than explains his Author's (*Mauriceau's*) Meaning; and confidently affirms, all the additional Knowledge he was the Author of, to be only to tell the World, that He, and his Family, can assist Women in Labour better than any body else, and gives him the mean Epitbet of a *Nostrum-monger*. (Page 4.) He pronounces every thing with an *ipse dixit*, like a second *Aristotle*, and sets himself up at once, both

both for *Judge* and *Jury*. The late learned Dr. *Friend*, in his *Epistle* to Dr. *Mead*, about *Purging* in the *Small Pox*, gives Dr. *Chamberlen* a very different Character from Mr. *Douglass*, speaking of him as one *most skilful* in the *Art* he profess'd; (*Hist.* 5.) Whence we may plainly see, how different the Character of the same Person is, when drawn by *real* and *pretended* Judges.

P. 5. He taxes him with perverting Mr. *Mauriceau's* Design by his Translation, and having his own Interest at heart more than that of the *Midwomen*, as he ridiculously terms them.

He accuses him of *coaxing* the *Midwomen*, and yet in the same Sentence *coaxes* them himself, and pays a fulsome Compliment to the Qualifications of the *Town Midwomen* above those in the *Country*. P. 5. The *Town Midwomen* may possibly (some of them) become his *Pupils*, when he gives his intended *Lectures*, and so ought in Prudence to be well spoken of. But those in the *Country* being too remote for this extraordinary Advantage, will, for aught I can see, in his Opinion, still labour under the Imputation of being *unqualified* (till his Scheme for having *Midmen* to instruct the *Midwomen* in *Country* places can take Effect) unless their Affairs can permit them to take a Journey to *Lad Lane*,

Lane, where, it seems, the only Person proper to instruct them is to be met with.

Upon Dr. *Chamberlen's* saying, " that
 " in Countries and Places where Advice
 " is not seasonably to be had, Midwives
 " are compelled to do their best, as God
 " shall enable them (P. 5.) " which is a
 common Expression for a conscientious
 discharge of their Duty, according to the
 best of their Abilities. Mr. *Douglass* takes
 occasion here, to cut a very indecent Joke
 upon the Deity, by asking, if God has any
 where promised to give any more Assistance
 to a Country, than a Town Midwoman? In
 the next place, he substitutes God and
 the Doctor acting as two equal Beings;
 and then, to prove that the Divine God-
 head will reward us with the Knowledge
 of any useful Art, in Proportion to our
 own honest Diligence and Assiduity, which
 in holy Writ he has assured us he will;
 or, which is the same thing, to prove a
 point of Revelation, he quotes a Passage
 from a Heathen Poet; *Dii laborantibus om-
 nia vendunt*: thereby making mention of
 false Gods in the plural Number, for what
 the true and one God only can perform.
Risum teneatis? Upon Dr. *Chamberlen's*
 advising the good Women not to blame
 those who are not backward in dangerous
 Cases, to desire Advice, lest it cost them
 dear; he indecently asks: *If it does not
 always*

always cost them dear when they do? Al-
luding, I presume, to the Gratifications u-
sually given in such Cases; notwithstanding
he advances, a little farther, that a SUR-
GEON ought to be well satisfied for any
Improvement in, or Invention relating to,
a manual Operation, P. 20. Is not *De-*
livery, wherever the Help of either Man
or Woman is required, in the strictest Sense
a manual Operation? And if so, why must
not a *Physician* be rewarded for his Trou-
ble, as well as a *Surgeon*. But *Self*, like
Oil, will be always uppermost.

In the same Page (the 7th.) the Plot of
Mr. *Douglass's* whole Performance begins to
open, when he says, that the *Midwomen's*
want of Knowledge is more their *Misfortune*
than their *Fault*, because they have not yet
had such proper Opportunities of informing
themselves as they ought to have. But
now it must hereafter be their *Fault* more
than their *Misfortune*, if they are not bet-
ter qualify'd, after knowing where the Source
of all Knowledge in *Midwifery* is to be
found. This is the first *Act* of Mr. *Dou-*
glass's Farce; and in the succeeding ones
the *Plot* will unravel itself more and more,
so as to be well understood by the dullest
Reader, unless I am much mistaken.

He asking (Pag. 8.) "Whether *Physi-*
cians don't always make a sad Out-cry,
B " and

" and are not alarm'd as if their *Craft*
 " was in danger, when *Surgeons* use *Pen*
 " and *Ink*, except in *PAUPER Cases*," is
 an indecent and false Reflection on the
 Gentlemen of the Faculty. Herein he
 brands *Physick*, that glorious Science, with
 the ignominious Name of a *Craft*; as if
 it were only a *knavish* Combination of
 Men to get Money, and at the same time
 openly taxes them with *Covetousness*, and
Hardness of Heart, in denying their Ad-
 vice to *Paupers*. It is well known, that
 all the Gentlemen of that Profession,
 whose Advice is worth having, are very
charitable, and willing to relieve the di-
 stressed Poor, without any View or Ex-
 pectation of *Gratification*. And where he
 can give me an Instance of one *Surgeon's*
 curing a *Wound*, setting a *Fracture*, or re-
 ducing a *dislocated Limb*, for nothing, I'll
 undertake to bring him *five Physicians*
 in this Town that have attended in the
 most noisome and contagious Distempers,
 without the least Desire of *Reward*: Nay,
 so far from it, they have relieved the
 Poor they have thus generously cur'd,
 with Money and other Necessaries out of
 their own private Bounty. But I shall
 leave this to the Resentment of those to
 whom it belongs.

In the same Page he says, that the
 Doctor allows Midwives are compell'd to
 do

do their best, as God shall direct them; to which he replies: *Now supposing God should direct one of them to make use of a Crotchet, in a fit Case, and after a proper manner, must she be try'd for her Life for it?* Which is another shocking Joke upon the Godhead, equal, if not superior to that before observed.

Here too is another *Coax* to the *London* Midwomen, that the hardiest of them would tremble, upon his Belief, at the very thought of a *Crotchet*, unless they were fully instructed how to use it. But poor unfortunate *Country Midwomen*! he cannot pretend to answer for them; They are at too remote a distance from *Lad Lane* to come to his *Lectures*; and if upon this melancholy occasion I may be allow'd to borrow a Scrap of *Latin* from him, *proh dolor!* O lack! O lack!

Page 9. Mr. Douglass asks, if Dr. Chamberlen's *Cobweb* is not easily seen thro' ? Now, were I disposed to Ill-nature, with how much more Justice might I apply this Saying to his own?

Page 12. He seems to own my Observation on Dr. Chamberlen's Secret just. But I was unwilling, like Mr. Douglass, to make any farther Remark upon it; and thought,

what I said sufficient, without an unmannerly Freedom.

Page 13. He bestows upon Dr. Chamberlen the ignominious Title of a *magisterial* and *dictatorial* Writer.

Not content with this, in the next Page (14.) he very candidly calls him, a *fulsome Repeater*, a *nauseous Recommender* of his *Nostrum*, a Writer that has not made one Remark to the Advantage of Midwomen, and one who seems to have had nothing else in view, but to tell them when they ought to send for him, and to let them know, that he, &c. could serve them better than any body else. All which may be reckoned as Proofs of Mr. Douglass's want of *Candour* and *good Manners*. And now to make use of his own Words, *utrum borum*, p. 54.

Page 20. He owns, that *Surgeons* who have made any considerable Discovery in *manual Operations*, which cannot be made universally useful, as *Medicines* may, and really are, unless they are fully and distinctly explain'd, should always communicate *gratis* the Fruits of their Labour and Expence. No, says he, they ought to be handsomely rewarded, not only for the real Service they have done, but to encourage

encourage Industry in others. Why then does he accuse me for keeping the use of the *Fillet* a Secret, which is in the strictest Sense a *manual* Operation, and one that cannot be made universally useful, as Medicines may? Indeed he has here spoke my own private Sentiments; in this we entirely agree; and I presume he will hardly hereafter ask me, why I don't communicate it? He himself, it seems from his own Words, cannot expect it *gratis*; so that he must first tell me what he will be pleased to offer, before we can come to any other Terms. However, for his Comfort, I promise him to be more reasonable than he says Dr. *Chamberlen* was with the *French King's Physician*, p. 19. and to be contented with less than Ten thousand Crowns; tho' in Proportion to the Superiority Mr. *Douglass* always seems to think *Surgeons* have over *Physicians*, I ought at least to insist upon Twenty thousand.

Page 21. He says Dr. *Chamberlen* is insolent, and there very candidly ranks *Doctors*, *Apothecaries*, *Shavers*, and *Nostrum-mongers*, all together; but has wisely left the *Surgeons*, and consequently himself, out of the Number, as being *superioris sortis* (still to borrow a little more of his Learning) to *Doctors* and *Apothecaries*. And now the Town has been informed of their superior

terior Merit, I hope no body will dare, after this publick Notification, to refuse them their proper Homage, upon pain of Mr. John Douglass's Displeasure.

In the same Page he puts a Question which no body ever denied: Whether the Good which Surgeons do their Patients be not as evident as the Sun? E.g. When they cut for the Stone, perforate the Skull, reduce a Luxation, &c. But it is doubtful, it seems, from Baglivi, whether the Cures suppos'd to be performed by Physicians, even those of the first Rank, are mostly owing to Nature, or the Medicines, &c. which they directed. No one, that I know of, has ever question'd the Good which Surgeons do in their own proper Profession; but I am afraid, when they go beyond their Last, they'll doubly verify Baglivi's Saying of the Physicians, and do more Harm than they are capable of foreseeing. Surgeons, he observes, only practise Midwifery in France; and so, says he, they ought to do every where else. What then in his Wisdom he will propose to be done with such Physicians as are engag'd in this Profession, I know not, unless he will generously procure them to be promoted to the Dignity of Slavers (among which he just now chose to rank them) for which the Faculty ought doubtless to be extremely thankful.

— A little

A little after, he accuses the Doctor of going out of his *Ken*; but why? Only because he pretends to advise the Surgeons. And in the next Page (22.) to be even with him for this *Presumption*, affirms, that the Doctor did not understand that very little part of *Surgery*, the Method of cutting Childrens Gums, so well as the very *Nurses*.

In the same Page he hints, as if the Doctor was not apprised of the use of the *Crotchet*; and in the next Page (23.) concludes, that Mr. Mauriceau was a good and faithful Surgeon, and Chamberlen only a ——— Doctor, with a long Dash before it. It is to be hop'd, Mr. Douglass may so far overcome his *Modesty*, as in the next Edition of his elaborate Performance, to fill up the *Blanks* that are in this. If the *Anithestis* here is to hold good, and Mr. Mauriceau was a good and faithful Surgeon, which I will not deny, the contrary Character must necessarily fall upon Dr. Chamberlen as a *Physician*. But how far Mr. Douglass is capable of judging of the Qualifications of a *Physician*, or who set him up for a *Censor*, I must leave the *Faculty* to determine.

Page 24. He sums up the whole he has to say in relation to Dr. Chamberlen, in

in telling us, that his main Design, in his Preface and Notes upon Mr. *Mauriceau's* Book, was to PUZZLE, rather than instruct the Midwomen or Midmen; and to persuade them, that He, and the rest of the *Nostrum-mongers*, as he ignominiously calls them, could serve them better than any other Artists.

Now, is not this a very fine Character of a *Physician*, who was allow'd by all proper Judges, to be a Man of great Honour and Abilities? If what he would insinuate be believ'd, must not the Doctor appear viler than a common *Pick-pocket* or *Street-robber*, wilfully to puzzle and mislead People in Matters relating to Life and Death? But what seems to stick most upon Mr. *Douglass's* Stomach, as a thing he can no ways digest, is the Doctor's recommending *Physicians* as fitter Persons to deliver Women than *Surgeons*. Will Mr. *Douglass* pretend to say, that the *Surgeons* have more Knowledge, Learning, and Abilities than the Gentlemen of the Faculty? If not, how come *Surgeons* to be more qualified for the Art of Midwifery than *Physicians*? But Self is here to be concerned; and Mr. *Douglass* seems inclin'd for the common Good, to turn those illiterate People the *Physicians* out of Practice, pointing out the Occupation he thinks them

them most fit to be employ'd in, under the
laudable Profession of *SHAVERS*.

From *Dr. Chamberlen*, *Mr. Douglass* proceeds to *Mr. Giffard*, Surgeon, another late Writer in Midwifery; for it seems they must all feel his *critical Lash*. But as I shall leave the Defence of *Mr. Giffard* to his Publisher, and Reviser, the ingenious *Dr. Hoddy*, who is much more capable of doing it than myself, I shall be short in my Remarks on this Head.

First then, upon *Mr. Giffard's* ingenuously relating, "That a Man-Midwife had work'd upon a poor Woman, and left her in a worse Condition than he found her," he makes this paultry *Witticism*, in a *Parentthesis*, That *Midmen* are not at all *Witches* any more than the *Midwomen*.

Pag. 25. A little after, upon *Mr. Giffard's* saying, that the Fate of those Children, whose *Placenta* offers first, is Death, if a proper Person be not at hand to deliver them immediately, he subjoins, who can be so proper, or likely to be in the Way, as a skilful *Midwoman*? and yet at the same time he observes, that as long as they want Skill to perform it, the Child must die before a *Midman* can be brought. Now where the good Women are to meet with this extraordinary Skill, the Reader will see in the Sequel.

Again, upon *Mr. Giffard's* candidly saying, "That Mischiefs may be prevented by a
C " skilful

“*skilful Operator*, if sent for in Time,” he replies, but much better if a *skilful Operatrix* attended ; thereby giving the *Old Women* the Preference before the *Surgeons*, which, as it does not seem to have been Mr. *Douglass’s* *Drift*, must be look’d upon as an *unwary Concession*.

Pag. 28. He asks what signifies finding fault with the Midwives in every Page without attempting a Remedy? And *Pag. 33.* affirms, that it is our Way to haul the Midwomen in HEAD and SHOULDERS, *guilty* or not *guilty*. To which I shall only reply, that one, if not the only, Method of attempting a Remedy, is, to find fault where they deserve it, and strictly, without *Favour* or *Prejudice*, to shew them their *Errors*; without which, they will never be much improv’d. But that we haul them in, as he expresses himself, *Head and Shoulders*, *guilty* or not *guilty*, is what Mr. *Douglass* ought first to have prov’d, before he had so roundly and uncharitably charg’d us with it.

Pag. 30. He asks if our Women are not as capable of being taught as the *French Women*? I answer in the Affirmative ; and beg he would tell me, who ever made a Question of it?

Pag. 36. Upon Mr. *Giffard’s* observing, what indeed is but too true, that the Men-Midwife’s being sent for, so late, too often proceeds from the *Ignorance* or *Self-sufficiency* of the

the *Midwife*, he excuses them, by affirming, that it is oftener from the *Modesty* of the *Women*, *Covetousness*, or real *Poverty* of the *Men*, &c. Thus you see his *Pupils*, the *Midwomen*, are infallible, and the Saddle is to be plac'd on any Horse rather than the *right* one. Had Mr. *Douglass* long *practis'd* the Art of *Midwifery*, he would have been sufficiently sensible, that many Men-Midwives have been hinder'd from being sent for in Cases of the utmost Extremity, where the *Sufferers* were *willing* enough to have had superior Advice, and the *Husbands* neither *covetous* nor *poor*.

Pag. 39. He says, it is true that Women may be taught the Method of touching with *very little Trouble*. Now if he makes the same Concession in relation to the other Branches of *Midwifery*, it is to be hop'd his *Lectures* may be heard at a *very little Expence*, which is a Consequence possibly he was not aware of.

From Mr. *Giffard*, Mr. *Douglass* advances to take notice of my own *Essay* upon *Midwifery*, first publish'd in 1733. and after I have dwelt so long in defending the Character of the two fore-mention'd Gentlemen, whose Shades are no way able to answer for themselves, I hope I shall not be thought too partial if I should now endeavour to defend my own, against Mr. *Douglass's* trifling and unjust *Aspersions*.

In the first place, he charges me with *complimenting* the Midwomen, because I wrote a Book for their Improvement, and thought that all the Treatises, hitherto written on this Subject, were calculated more for the Instruction of my own Sex than the other. *Pag. 41.* This he affirms to be a *Mistake*, because, he says, Madam *Du Tertre* compos'd her Book for the Use of the Midwives Apprentices in the *Hotel Dieu*, and Madam *Louys Burgeois's* Book was translated into *English*, and put forth for the sole Use of *Midwives*. Now as to the first, I presume it never was translated (from his own Pretensions to undertake it) and I do not pretend to understand the *French* Language. As to the other, I never saw it, or heard of it before.

Upon my saying, " That I have daily, during the Space of above twenty Years Practice, seen many fatal Mistakes committed by Midwives," he asks, what Sort of Midwives these must have been, who committed fatal Mistakes, *every Day*, for above twenty Years together? By Daily, I did not think I should be understood every particular Day, but that I had frequently seen such fatal Practices, as himself doubtless *would*, had he ever been conversant in the Practice of that *Art* he would have the World believe him so expert in. Nor can I help observing in this Place, that Mr. *Douglafs* cannot be a proper Person to instruct others, as not being Master of the

the Art *himself*. He then puts a Quere, how are the *civil Magistrates* to be appriz'd of their *Mal-practice*, if the honest *Testimonies* of such as are call'd in upon them, and are *Witnesses* and *Judges* of it, are not to be regarded? How are the Women themselves to be made sensible of their *Errors* if their Superiors are denied the Liberty of *reproving* them, when *faulty*, and freely professing the *Truth*? If the *Men* are to be blam'd for their *Integrity* and *Impartiality*, and accus'd of hauling the Women in *Head and Shoulders*, *guilty* or not *guilty*, whenever they blame the Midwives for their *Faults*, Mr. *Douglass's* Quere, in relation to the *civil Magistrates*, is like for ever to remain unanswer'd.

Again, upon my delivering it as my Opinion, " That such Mistakes could not have
 " happen'd had they ever read a Treatise so
 " properly adapted to their Capacities, and at
 " the same time so full and plain as I hop'd
 " my own to be," he asks, with his wonted Candour, whether, if they had read *Madam Du Tertre's* little Book, they would not have found it more properly adapted to their Capacities, as full and plain, and her Sentiments more accurately expressed? To which I reply, as having never *seen*, nor been able to *understand* her Book, if I had; *that I cannot tell*. Tho' at the same time I must, in justice to myself, observe, that I cannot see what relation this has to the Matter in Dispute; nor can *Madam Du Tertre's* little Book, being as full
 and

and plain, or more accurately express'd, than mine, hinder mine from being *full* and *plain* too, which is all that I have asserted.

Besides, if *forty* Persons, as well as Madam *Du Tertre*, had made the same Improvements and Observations in Practice, and wrote them in a *Language* I do not understand how does that *detract* from, or *lessen* any thing I advance? A candid Person would think that it rather *confirm'd* it.

In the next place he taxes me with having the same Aim he has the Assurance to assert Dr. *Chamberlen* had; namely, *to tell the Midwomen, when, and in what particular Cases to send for my superior Advice, and not to instruct them how to give better Assistance themselves.* After the very indecent Freedom he has taken with the Character of Dr. *Chamberlen*, I cannot wonder at any he can take with *mine*, as most willingly owning my own Inferiority. But before Mr. *Douglass* had tax'd me with this uncharitable Way of proceeding, he ought to have been better acquainted with me than he seems to be, and to have prov'd, *that I have not laid down any Rules for the Improvement and Advantage of Midwives.* Will he affirm that I have advanc'd *nothing* towards their Instruction? If so, let him ingenuously prove it, not by low and impertinent *Cavils*, but *cool* and *sober Arguments*, and not arrogate to himself the Offices of both *Judge* and *Executioner*, in a Cause wherein he appears only as an Accuser;

cufer ; and I doubt not, but that before I have done pleading, the *Court* of impartial *Readers* will look upon his *Prosecution* as entirely *malicious*, and readily grant me a *Copy* of my *Inditement*. Does not he own that *Madam Du Tertre* and *myself* have advanc'd the same *Methods* of *Practice*? And does not he highly extol many *Things* in *her* *Treatise* which are found in *mine*? Since then we have liv'd in different *Ages*, and have never had the least *Knowledge* of one another, how can that *Practice* be esteem'd *bad* in *me*, which is reckon'd so *extraordinary* in *Madam Du Tertre*?

Pag. 43. He accuses me of first *coaxing*, and then *threatening* the *Midwives*, as *Dr. Chamberlen* did before me, because I say, “ I have
 “ ever found the most experienced *Midwives*
 “ the most ready to call in farther *Assistance*,
 “ and that they find their *Account* in it ; whilst
 “ it is quite otherwise with those, who, from
 “ too great an *Opinion* of their own *Judg-*
 “ *ment* and *Abilities*, run great *Hazards*, or
 “ at the best call us in too late, and so lose
 “ their good *Name*, and justly suffer in their
 “ *Reputation*. That the best *Midwives* send
 “ early for *Advice* upon *Appearance* of *Dan-*
 “ *ger* and *Difficulty* ; the suffering *Fair* readily
 “ consents to it, and by this means both *Lives*
 “ are fav'd.” Pray who can see any thing in
 this *Passage* like *coaxing* or *threatening*, or in-
 deed any thing else, but *plain* and known
Truth? I would desire to know, who *coaxes*
 the

the Women, when he immediately asks, “ if
 “ the suffering Fair would not have been much
 “ more oblig’d to her *Midwoman*, if she had
 “ perform’d the Work herself, and thereby
 “ sav’d both the *Uneasiness* and *Expence* of
 “ superior Advice.” Of the first Part of this
 Accusation then, he appears to be guilty him-
 self, and the Reader need not be at a Loss for
 the Reason of it. But as for *threatening*, that
 was not Mr. *Douglass’s* Intention at a Time
 when he was bespeaking them for his *Pupils*;
 for it must be a very silly Bird indeed, that,
 according to the Proverb, bewrays its own Nest.
 He likewise desires to know, “ If these two
 “ Speeches were not pick’d out of Dr. *Cham-*
 “ *berlen’s* Preface?” I answer, *No*; but must
 beg leave to subjoin, that I shall never have
 the worse Opinion of myself for thinking alike
 with so great a Man, notwithstanding Mr.
Douglass is pleas’d to give him the Title of a
puzzling, confounding, insinuating, insolent
Nostrum-monger.

Upon my saying, “ That I have an In-
 “ vention of my own to extract Children when
 “ the *Head* presents and sticks in the Passage,
 “ with the *Fillet*, which I must beg leave to
 “ be silent in, as the great Dr. *Chamberlen* was
 “ before me, in chusing to conceal the Method
 “ whereby he could extract Children in this
 “ Case without *Hooks*, where other Artists
 “ are forc’d to use them,” he adds, *was there*
ever such an Excuse heard of? Because the
 great Dr. *Chamberlen*, says he, acted a very
 ungenerous

ungenerous Part in this Affair, therefore Mr. Chapman must be excus'd for doing just the same Thing. Then he asks, whether I might not as well have said, *That the Doctor had been guilty of Simony or Sacrilege, and was not punish'd for it, and therefore I might, for the same Reason, expect the same Grace, in case I should ever take it in my Head to commit the same Crimes?* Not remembering his former Declaration, Pag. 20. Of his being far from thinking that the Publick has any Right to expect, that every private Man (who at a considerable Expence, and assiduous Study, makes any considerable Discovery in Manual Operations which cannot be made universally useful, as Medicines may, and really are, &c.) should communicate gratis the Fruits of his Labour and Expence. Besides at the same time that I keep the *Fillet* a Secret, I frankly own the *Forceps* to be preferable, for which I give my Reasons. How then can the Concealment of the former be an Injury to any?

A little after, Pag. 45. he taxes me with being mistaken, in affirming, that I was the second *Englishman* who wrote originally and professedly on this Subject. Now I never affirm'd that I was the second *Englishman*, &c. only said, if I was not mistaken, &c. (a) This I afterwards was sensible of, and accordingly candidly own'd it, in my second Edition, in the following Words. (b) *When I publish'd the*
D *first*

(a) *Essay on Midwifery*, first Edit. Preface, last Page but one.

(b) Second-Edit. Preface, p. 22.

first Edition of this Work, I thought myself, at least, the second Englishman, who had written professedly on the Subject; I have since found I was mistaken, &c. so that Mr. Douglass himself is here guilty of a *Mistake*, if not a wilful *Misrepresentation*. Tho' whether I was right or wrong in this, 'tis nothing to the Subject Matter, and at best but a low and trifling *Cavil*.

Upon my saying, if the Child offers any other Part than the *Head*, be it what it will, the Hand is to be pass'd gently into the Womb, the Feet are to be search'd for, the Child to be turn'd, and that Way brought forth; and *Pag. 20*. Having farther observ'd, that a Child, presenting with its *Head*, is often to be turn'd and deliver'd with the *Feet* first, and in all other Postures whatever always with the *Feet* first, Mr. Douglass proceeds, But suppose a *Foot*, or the *Feet* present, what need have we then to pass the Hand into the Womb to fetch them? And suppose the *Buttocks* present, and are so low in the Passage that they cannot be push'd back without Danger, is it not much easier and quicker to slip the Fingers over the Bend of the *Thigh*, or over the *Ossa Ilii*, and draw it forward in that Posture, than to run the risque of forcing them back to come at the *Feet*? And then triumphantly concludes it to be plain from these Quotations, That I, notwithstanding my 25 Years Practice, was perfectly unacquainted with this Case, tho' Madam Du Tertre describes it very

very accurately. I have said in my *first* Edition, *except when it presents with the Feet, &c.* And, in my *second*, have mention'd the *Buttocks*, and when the Child may be brought away in that Posture. *Pag. 11.* I own there (by making that Case an *Exception*) that this had *slipp'd* me in the first, so that nothing is more plain, than that I was not *unacquainted* with the Case, tho' Mr. *Douglass* is pleased, with his usual *Candour*, to accuse me of being *perfectly* so. No Person can possibly imagine a Case of that Nature should never happen to me in twenty seven Years extensive Practice. And tho' I forgot to take notice of it in the *Essay*, yet I have sufficiently mention'd it in my *Treatise*. So that if the *former* had been much more imperfect in this respect than it is, yet as it stands corrected in the *latter*, it must certainly be very unfair and ungenerous to fix upon any but the *last* Edition.

Upon my giving an Account of having with my Finger dilated and cast back the Mouth of the Womb, and so releas'd a little Prisoner, he asks, if Madam *Du Tertre's* Finger would not have released the Prisoner as soon, and as safely as mine? *Pag. 47.* Upon my saying again, that more than *two* Inches of the String itself, from the Navel, is unnecessary, whereas I have commonly known Midwives leave *five* or *six*, he adds, that Madam *Du Tertre* likewise advises the String to be tied *two* Inches from the Child's Navel, and then triumphs

triumphs in the following Manner, *Where now is the mighty Secret he makes such a Fuss about? Is it any thing more than an OLD WOMAN told us before he was born?* Pag. 48. Upon saying too, that it is my constant Practice to pass my Hand immediately after the Birth, in order to extract the *Placenta*; he enquires what there is so extraordinary in it, that it deserves to be noted so emphatically, *as my constant Practice is?* And then asks if *Madam Du Tertre*, &c. did not so? Pag. 56. Again, he twits Dr. *Mau-bray*, as well as myself, with *Madam Du Tertre*, as likewise in Pag. 59. And lastly, Pag. 61. Upon my declaring my Unwillingness to put a Person upon her Labour too early, which God knows is too often done, he asks if *Madam Du Tertre* would not as carefully have avoided putting her upon her Labour before her Time, as I did?

As for *Madam Du Tertre* and myself being of the same Opinion, I cannot possibly see how he can fairly turn that to my Disadvantage, since what is *right* in *Madam Du Tertre* can never be *wrong* in me. So that instead of doing me an *Injury*, which I think was plainly his Intention, by such trifling Insinuations, he has paid me a handsome *Compliment*, in owning my Practice to be the same with *Madam Du Tertre's*, whom he seems to be so very fond of.

To return; Pag. 47. After repeating what I have said in relation to the Folly of dipping the
the

the Infant's Hand, when hanging out of the Womb, in cold Water, rubbing it with Ice, or touching it with a wet Cloth, which some ignorant Midwives practise, he desires to be inform'd, "how many Midwives I have ever known guilty of these Fooleries?" I answer too many; and it is probable, had Mr. *Douglafs* long practis'd the Art of Midwifery, he would have met with the same.

A much greater Instance, of his being but little conversant in this Art, he gives us in the very next Page, where, upon my saying that few Midwives are sufficiently appriz'd of the unhappy Symptom there mention'd, *viz.* a violent *Flooding*, he declares, that he differs so far from me, in this Assertion, that, in his Opinion, there is not *one* Midwife in a *thousand* who knows not, that a violent *Flooding* will either occasion Abortion or Death. I confess few, if any Midwives, can be so totally ignorant, as not to know that *Flooding* will occasion Death if no Stop be put to its Fury. Yet many are apt to flatter themselves, that the Sufferer may be deliver'd by her natural Pains, till it is too late, as appears from several Cases I have cited (few to what I could have given) which shews they were not sufficiently appriz'd of the Danger. And I hope I may be excused being so full on this Head, as many have been before me, since it is a Thing of such vast Consequence in *Practice*.

But

But to return back to Mr. Douglass's Observation in relation to what I advanc'd about the *Navel-string*, Pag. 48. I thought it proper to mention what I have there said, as I had very often found the leaving so much of the String to be a common Practice, and indeed the Custom of most Midwives in the Country. I never once mention'd it as a *Secret*; so the Fuss about it, as he elegantly words it, is with *himself*.

Again, as to his Quere, whether it is not every Body's Practice to pass their Hand immediately and examine if there are any more Children, and if no more, to fetch the *Placenta*? I answer No; not even among the Assistants of my own Sex, much less with the *Women*, for I assert that few of them take this Method.

Few Midwives, even in this *Town*, pass their Hand (if I may give credit to *their* Declaration, and my own *Experience*) and fewer yet in the Country. So that the Woman in whose Case this is mention'd had really stood but a bad Chance; had an ignorant Midwife been call'd in upon her, as I have there affirm'd. Here Mr. Douglass has certainly burnt his Fingers, and taken hold of one of the best Observations in my whole Book; which may serve to shew his extraordinary *Judgment*. That few Midwives in this Town do pass their Hand is an Affirmation

Affirmation I dare submit to the Chief of the Profession. Pray whence comes it that we are so often sent for to extract the *Placenta*?

Is not what I have wrote on this Subject Matter of *Instruction* to Midwives? And therefore as it is against my own Interest, it must be judg'd to be *honest* at least, which, I trust will have no small Weight in my Favour.

If I have written any thing that will not stand the Test, but that my *Herculean* Antagonist does not pretend to, why do not proper Judges disprove me? If nothing but what will stand the Trial, why must I be loaded with such trifling and malicious *Cavils*? Really I think no one more unhappy, than he who *snarls*, and shews his *Teeth*, yet cannot bite; and I at once despise and pity such a Person.

All Midwives are not *Du Tertre's*; and why I should not say, *this is my constant Practice*, I know not; nor do I see wherein I could offend any Person thereby (and nothing surely but *Calumny* and *Ill-nature* could ever have suggested a Censure from this.) How wrongfully then does he accuse me of having condemn'd the Midwives unjustly, because I affirm, that if an ignorant Midwife had been concern'd in the Case abovementioned, who had only taken the first Child and After-birth, the last would probably

bably have been left behind, and either violent Flooding, or a bad Fever would have ensued ; and, as the Woman was before ill, and extremely weak, it would very likely have cost her her Life ? Is not what I have said *true* ? Can what is here spoken, of an *ignorant* Midwife, belong to a *good* one ? And would not one, ignorant of her Profession, have occasion'd in all Probability the Misfortune I there mention ? For I say again, that few do pass their Hand. Upon the whole then, I think I may with most Justice retort his own Words upon him, and apply what he says of the Midwives to myself, *viz.* *That, guilty or not guilty, 'tis all one, I must be baul'd in, and condemn'd for an imaginary as well as a real Fault.* Pag. 50.

Pag. 51. He relates the Case of my being sent for to a Gentlewoman who kept a Tavern at *Ipswich*, *viz.* that the Child was *dead*, and the Mother *flooding* ; that when two Midwives and a *Surgeon*, just then set out in the Profession, had all us'd their Endeavours to little or no Purpose, I was call'd in, and deliver'd her in a Minute ; that I left her under the Care of *Dr. Beeston*, but that she died in six or seven Days. Upon this he very candidly observes, that I have not indeed told this young Gentleman's Name, tho' I have describ'd him so well that he doubts there's not a Man in all *Ipswich*, nor perhaps *twenty* Miles round, but can tell who I mean ; and then craftily insinuates, *What Injury might not such a Tale do a worthy*
young

young Fellow? And twits me with being inconsistent with myself, in relation to the Advice I gave in *Pag. 114.* of my first Edition; namely, that we should not take an unkind Advantage of a Slip or Accident that may happen to befall a Brother in his Practice.

I hope I cannot fairly be charg'd with being inconsistent with myself, or taking an unkind Advantage of a Brother, whereas the Publication of my Essay was many Years after the Case referr'd to, and the young Surgeon there mention'd, had in all Probability, either given up that Branch of Practice, or was well establish'd in it.

In the next Page he cites a Passage from my *Preface*, wherein I say that the Dignity of this Art will appear to every Person in a much more advantageous Light, if we reflect on the Learning of the Professors of it, and then ignominiously subjoins, *E. G. Dr. C—, Dr. M—, Dr. W—, Dr. G—, Dr. A—, Dr. B—, Dr. Gregoire, Tota notus in Urbe!* &c. It is much to be wish'd that Mr. *Douglass* had condescended so far as to have fill'd up this formidable Catalogue of Blanks, that the Gentlemen, he there reflects upon, might have a fair Opportunity of defending themselves from such scurrilous Treatment. Is this being consistent with himself, to charge me with *detracting from a young Surgeon's Character*, in so favourable a Manner; as not to give even the initial Letter of his Name; when in the very

next Paragraph, he uncharitably and maliciously insults the Reputation of no less than seven Physicians, as he himself seems to own, by giving them all the Title of Doctor; but if by this he would only aim at those who would willingly impose themselves upon the World as such, he should have told us their real Names, that Gentlemen of Learning and Character may not suffer thereby; there being several Physicians of Reputation in this City, the initial Letters of whose Names are the *same* he has thought fit to set down.

Upon my saying, that the Improvements these, great Men have made in this Art, have effectually wip'd away the Load of Slander and Ignominy, with which this Profession was formerly branded, he has the *Assurance* to ask, for I can call it nothing else, if *ninety nine* in a *hundred* (a pretty large Proportion truly) of these great Men I talk of, have not kept their Improvements to themselves? With this insinuating Doubt, *if ever they made any.*

Now if this be not scurrilous Treatment, I know not what can possibly be so. But this is not all, he proceeds farther, and asks if most of them now, as well as myself, don't pretend to have Secrets? And if they don't endeavour to *puzzle*, at the same time they make a show of *instructing* others? Don't they, says he likewise, *very seldom, if ever, consult together, as they always ought to do in difficult or* *dan-*

dangerous Cases? And then asks, *What can hinder them, except the Fear of discovering the Insignificancy of their pretended Secret, or their REAL IGNORANCE?* What intolerable Usage is here? What Opinion must By-standers have of the Profession, when one, who would impose himself upon the Town as a Judge, represents the Professors of it as a Set of crafty, puzzling, ignorant People? How far his Fellow Citizens are to thank him, for deterring, by false and malicious Hints, those who are already (from a mistaken and blameable Modesty) too averse to the Assistance of Men-Midwives, in Cases of Extremity, where a faithful *Wife*, or hopeful *Heir* may perhaps be lost, is what I think every reasonable Man may determine. But I shall leave him to the Resentment of those worthy Gentlemen he has so much insulted, and only observe farther on this Head, that I well hop'd, (and still with Reason do) that the late, and present Practitioners, had wip'd off the Load of Scandal that was us'd to blacken this Profession, and design'd a just Compliment to them. But nothing can stand good where *Envy* and *Ill-nature* meet. And indeed if they have not done it, I can only be accus'd of being too complaisant; which is a Fault I must do Mr. Douglass the Justice to own he has no where in his Book been guilty of, unless once to his Friend and Countryman, Dr. Mitchell, as will presently be made appear.

Upon my saying, in the *second* Edition of my Book, that I did not send my Papers to the *Press* till I had got a Friend to revise and correct the *Diſſen*, which I believe is not an usual thing, he desires to be inform'd, if I can be a tolerable Judge of *Diſſen* myself, who have suffer'd my Friend to write *Woman-Midwife*, *Women-Midwives*, &c. and then blames me, or my *Corrector*, for calling Dr. *Maubray* an ingenious and laborious Author, endeavouring, at the same time, to set the *Doctor* in a very ridiculous Light. Now allowing Dr. *Maubray* to be as silly a Writer as Mr. *Douglafs* would have him, he must own at least, that I have some *Good-nature* in me (to which Mr. *Douglafs* seems to be a Stranger) to allow him a Character he did not well deserve. I shall always endeavour to speak with *Modesty* and *Respect* of my *Superiors*; not following Mr. *Douglafs*'s Example in recommending and puffing myself to the Town, as the only *Dictator* left in my Profession.

After Mr. *Douglafs* has vented his Spleen upon the Doctor, he triumphs in the following Manner. "Pray does such a Writer as this "deserve the Epithets of *ingenious* and *laborious*? Wherein does his *Ingenuity* appear? "Wherein is his Labour of any Use? Pray "can any thing expose a Man's Judgment "more than *laughing* or *kissing*, *praising* or "finding fault in the *wrong Place*" Pag. 56.

— Without

Without doubt Mr. *Douglass* has Penetration enough to avoid those *Sands* in which he sees others *sink*; and so great a *Reformer* as himself can never be suspected of being guilty of those Faults he so vehemently reproveth in others. But to judge him now by his own Words. He reprimands me for calling Dr. *Maubray*, an *ingenious* and *laborious Author*, and at the same time gives the late Dr. *Mitchell* the Epithets, of a *just, tart, reverend, and learned* Writer. After what I have advanc'd above, in relation to Mr. *Douglass's* very ill Usage of the Gentlemen of the *Faculty*, it may seem odd perhaps, that I should here question the Reputation of any Gentleman myself; nor should any thing have induc'd me to it, had I not here a very fair Opportunity to display Mr. *Douglass's* great Partiality. In order to which I appeal to all the Physicians in this Town, to whom the LEARNED Dr. *Mitchell*, as he calls him, was but too well known, whether he was not the great *Physical-fool* of the Age? The *standing Jest* of all his Acquaintance? Tho' some Men of Sense thought him too low even for that, And as for his SOOTER-KIN DISSECTED, wherein, Mr. *Douglass* says, he has so JUSTLY and TARTLY reprimanded Dr. *Maubray* (who certainly deserv'd it for such a false and credulous Surmise as the Existence of the *Suyger* or *Sucher*, had Dr. *Mitchell* been able to have done it) it is too well known, for its execrable Stupidity, to need any Examination in this Place. For the Truth of which

I'll

I'll stand by the Determination of the most *partial* Reader that ever perus'd this extraordinary Performance, excepting only Mr. *Douglass*, who, if he went thro' it with a *grave* and *composed* Countenance, is, I believe, the only one that ever did. Mr. *Douglass* too assures us, that he was, *Utriusque Medicinæ Doctor*. P. 55. Greatly to the Honour of both the Professions no doubt! Pray was not desiring him to shew his *Diploma*, which some Gentlemen of top Reputation thought to be a *sham* one, a standing Jest at *Child's*? Was it not always produc'd with the utmost Shame and Reluctance?

Now to retort Mr. *Douglass's* Words upon himself, which may be done with the utmost Justice; pray does such a Writer as this deserve the Epithets of *just*, *tart*, *reverend*, or *learned*? *Risum teneatis*? Wherein does his *Tartness* or *Learning* appear? Pray can any thing expose a Man's *Judgment* more than *laughing* or *bissing*, *praising* or *finding fault* in the *wrong Place*? And pray who would think Mr. *Douglass* a Judge of *Learning* himself, who calls such a Writer as this, a *LEARNED* one?

But to return; what had I to do with Dr. *Maubray's* Treatise, beyond what belong'd to my Subject? He might be very *learned* and *laborious*, yet *erraneous* too; as I prove he was in relation to the *Forceps*, in which being oblig'd to be close upon him, I thought I could do no less than do him Justice where I found him right. I had no Business rudely to rake into his

his Ashes, neither was I answering or writing against his Book. Besides, I shew'd him the more Respect, from hearing him well spoken of by better Judges than Mr. *John Douglass*, or myself. Nor could I imagine a Piece of *just Civility* would ever have been made so ill-natur'd an Use of by any, much less by the Doctor's own Countryman. Had I treated Dr. *Maubray* with the ungentlemanlike Freedom Mr. *Douglass* has Dr. *Chamberlen*, he might then, and I doubt not would, have fallen upon me for that too. So that *civil* or *uncivil*, *guilty* or *not guilty*, I must be *haul'd in*, as he says the *Midwomen* are, by the *Head* and *Shoulders*. Pag. 55. He hopes I will explain the Doctor's Account of Men being chang'd into Women, in my next Edition, for he owns, as it stands in the Doctor's Book, it is far beyond his Comprehension; and that the Account he gives of it is so sublime, that it rather *puzzles* than *instructs* him. But in the Name of Wonder what is all this to me? What have I to do to explain in any Author that which is foreign to my Subject. If I am to answer for all the *filly* or *wrong* things that are advanc'd in *Authors*, I shall have enough to do with a Witness.

He says I make a great SPLUTTER (elegant indeed!) about breaking the Membranes of the second Child, in Order to bring it away by the Feet, as if I had discover'd something new. But however, to make me some amends, he

imme-

immediately pays me a great Compliment, by observing that Dr. *Maubray's* Words on this Occasion, which, he says, are perfect NONSENSE, are very *different from mine*; which, as it is the only Place in his whole Book wherein he seems to have any tolerable Opinion of me, I would not be thought so *ungrateful* as not to take some notice of it. I never imagin'd that in this Case I had discover'd any thing new; and what I there said was for the Information of Women, who most of them, if not all, leave the Birth of the second Child to *Nature*. So that I think his own very genteel SPLUTTER might have been as well omitted.

In the same Page he asks, "Who ever call'd the Flowing of the Waters a Flooding, but myself." And observes, that every body else means a dangerous Flux of Blood by a Flooding. I never did call the *Flowing of the Waters* a Flooding. It's a base and false Charge. Pray have not I taken notice, that the *Flowing of the Waters* was wrongfully call'd a Flooding? What Mr. *Douglass*, then has here said might have been let alone. I could as easily have call'd it NONSENSE as himself.

Again, because I honestly and earnestly recommend the careful Extraction of the *Placenta*, which can never be left behind without the greatest Danger, he observes, *Pag. 57.* after his *Laconick* Manner, that I make a great ROUT about it for three Pages together, as if no body had known any thing of the Matter before; and

and upon my saying that I am glad to find Dr. Maubray recommending so safe a Practice, he asks, "If I can find any body who does not recommend it, as well as Dr. Maubray and myself?" Let who will recommend or *recommenda* it, I'm sure I have found several that don't *practise* it, to the endangering of their Patients Lives; and to prevent such *Consequences* for the future, was the Reason of my making such a Report about it, or rather so faithfully and earnestly recommending it.

I still assert that the *Placenta* is often left by *Midwives*, and for their Instruction alone, it was I spoke so much about it. How then can what I have said be call'd a Report? But Mr. Douglass must necessarily be *elegant* if he writes at all.

He affirms in the same Page 57. That I have censur'd *Dionis*, which I think I have done with a deal of Justice, for saying, "That the *Placenta* in an Abortion of two or three Months may be left to come away of itself," and then replies, That undoubtedly this may very often be done without ANY Danger, tho' he adds, that it is certainly SAFER to bring it away at first, if sent for in Time, &c. which seems to me to be *Nonsense*, for if it be *safer* to bring it away at first, how can it be left without any Danger? Does not the Word *safer* naturally imply a Danger in its being left behind? If not, how can one Practice be *safer* than the other? If the Child has been come away some Time,

he

he says, he should give himself no Trouble about it till a Flooding appear'd, and affirms, that he knew it once left whole (by the Obstinacy of the Mother, who could by no means be persuaded to have it taken away) between the fourth and fifth Month, and yet she did very well. Whether the Words, *I knew it once*, were here meant to signify his own practising of this Art, I cannot determine; but he himself seems to think this Practice *wrong* by *blaming* the Woman with *Obstinacy*, for not consenting to have it taken away. Indeed, as he says, she might notwithstanding this have done well; but then it was certainly great odds she might not, and her Recovery was doubtless more owing to good luck than any thing else.

He says the experienc'd Mr. *Giffard* is also of the same Opinion, when he observes, "That
 " of two Evils the greater ought to be shunn'd,
 " there being less Danger in leaving Part of
 " the After-birth, which will very often, with-
 " out doing any great harm, come away with
 " the *Lochia*, than in using any force in ex-
 " tracting it, by which we very often hurt the
 " Womb." Without doubt of *two* Evils the
lesser ought always to be chosen; but I think
 Mr. *Giffard*'s Words are here to be taken with
 great Restriction. For his saying that the re-
 maining Part of the *Placenta* will *often* come
 away with the *Lochia*, implies that it will not
always do so; and that it will do no *great*
harm plainly intimates that it may do *some*.
 The *Womb* to be sure is never to be hurt,
 in

in extracting the *Placenta*; and when it cannot be got away, without doing more harm than the Retention of it may occasion (which I believe but seldom happens) it must doubtless be left behind. But then this is nothing to the *Necessity* of its being always taken away, which is what I have so earnestly recommended. Will Mr. *Douglass* affirm, that it is ever safer to have it *retain'd*, than *extracted*? I hope he will not pretend to give this Advice in his *Lectures*, lest Mankind should be but little indebted to him, and the State of *Midwifery*, after his mighty Endeavours to reform it, be left in a much worse Condition than he found it. This ought to be look'd upon as one of the most certain *Maxims* in Practice, that, where it can possibly be done, the Womb ought to be clear'd, and nothing suffer'd to be included in it, lest a *Fever* or *Flooding* should ensue, which are but too commonly the Consequences of such a Neglect.

A little after, he says, I give one Instance of a Child I deliver'd with the *Buttocks* foremost, and then asks, how does this *quadrate*, with what I say, *Pag. 11.* of the same Book. " If the Child offers any other part than the Head, the Hand is to be pass'd into the Womb, the Feet search'd for, and the Child to be turn'd, and brought forth by them." Here he wilfully omits an Exception I make in the very next Line, thus: *But there is one Case to be excepted, viz. when the Child presents the Buttocks, and is far advanc'd in that Posture,*

even beyond the Labia; it is then to be extracted as it lies: which I should chuse to perform by passing a Finger or two of one Hand, or if possible of both Hands to the Groin, and thus bring the Child away, rather than attempt the FEET: This however can be done only when the Child is small, or the Woman large; otherwise the Woman is to be laid on her Back, with her Hips rais'd, and her Shoulders low, and then the Child to be return'd, so as the Feet may be commanded.

In the same Page, after having repeated what I said, in Case of a Child that was extracted with its Face lying towards the Os Pubis, Pag. 174. of my second Edit. "That
 " I was unwilling to have recourse to Art."
 He proceeds, " Is it not the Art of Midwifery,
 " which the Midwomen have been taught, the
 " only thing which distinguishes them from
 " other Women? Are not they oblig'd to
 " make use of their Art at every Labour they
 " are call'd to? Why then does he so often
 " make use of the Words *Art* and *Artists*, and
 " only apply them to himself and some other
 " Men? Won't any one, who reads Madam
 " Du Tertre's little Book, be convinc'd, that
 " she has shewn more Art, and better Diction,
 " than either Dr. Maubray, or — Does her
 " being a Woman make it improper to say,
 " she had Recourse to *Art*, or that she was an
 " *Artist*?"

I shall only observe here, that all the common Assistance was before given; and as all Artists well know, the Expulsion now lay wholly upon *Nature*, except the taking hold of the *Head*, which I was unwilling to come to, if *Nature* would have finish'd her Work herself. But what harm there is in making use of the Terms *Art* and *Artists*, I profess myself utterly incapable to comprehend. As to his Query, why I keep the *Fillet* a Secret, after I have own'd it to be neither so speedy nor so secure a Method as the *Forceps*? *Pag.* 59. I shall only answer, That I was fairly and honestly resolv'd to own as much, and that I had already done it in the Body of my Treatise. So how insignificant this Remark is, will appear to every Reader.

But in relation to his charging me with the Cut of the *Forceps* being but an indifferent one, *Pag.* 60. I think I am not to answer for the Fault of the *Engraver*, since the Form and Dimensions, the Use and Advantage are the same, whether well represented or not?

Again, as to his asserting that I endeavour to fob him off with saying, that all other People's *Fillets* are for the *Foot*, and mine only for the *Head*, I heartily disown it. I never yet said that all other People's were for the *Foot*, &c. but only that I did not believe the manner of passing it over the *Head* to be so universally known, and practis'd. Which I still have as
much

much Reason to believe as ever; and if so, why must not I have the Liberty to mention it?

Pag. 62. After repeating two Instances wherein Mr. Giffard and myself have complain'd of *Mal-Practice*, he subjoins, " Could " a *Turk* believe there were any wholesome " Laws in a Country where such Barbarities " were not severely punished?" To which I shall only reply, as I have once before observ'd, how can the guilty be punish'd for them, or how can their Faults ever come to the Cognizance of the Publick, if those who are Witnesses of them, and candidly relate them, must have a Noise and Clamour rais'd against them, for so doing, and be represented as a Set of *partial designing Men*, *hauling in the Women by the Head and Shoulders*, and accusing them whether guilty or not?

In the Instance of *Mal-Practice* there mention'd, I have observ'd, that a Physician was sent for, who had lately taken upon him to practise Midwifery, *but was so little acquainted with the Art, that he neglected the only thing necessary in that Case*, viz. a speedy Delivery by turning the Child; which Words, mark'd here in *Italick*, he reprints in *capital Letters*, as pointing out, I presume, my indecent Usage of a Gentleman of the Faculty. But if such a Representation of bad Practice, as this, deserves to be distinguish'd in *Capitals*, where shall we find Letters or Paper large enough to display

display his own gross Usage of Dr. Chamberlen,
and other Physicians?

Pag. 63. Mr. Douglass makes a very ungentleman like Reflection on many great and worthy Gentlemen of the Faculty of Physick, and asks where these Doctors could be admitted to their Degrees? Must it not, says he, have been in some *Popish* Country, where Orthodoxy is reckoned a better Recommendation than the Knowledge of Diseases? Where visiting *Chapels* three or four times a Day is thought more conducive to the making a good *Physician*, than frequenting the *Hospitals* as often? Among the rest he here ungenerously reflects on *one*, who when he wrote this had the Honour to be related to (I mean his own Brother, lately dead at *St. Christophers*) who, I have been told, took his Degree in *France*. But what has the Religion of a Country to do with *Art* and Science? Have not several extraordinary Men in the Profession, nay some of the greatest Ornaments of it, taken their Degrees in *Popish* Countries. To mention no more than his favourite *Baglivi*, whom he justly stiles incomparable?

I shall dwell no longer on this ungenerous Subject, than whilst I put the following *Queries* to him;

1. Whether his witty Reflections on Degrees taken in a *Popish* Country, are not a monstrous

fruous Mixture of Impertinence, Ill-manners
and Falshood?

2. Whether a Man is better qualified for Practice in *England*, who has been complimented with a Degree from *Leyden*, a *Scots University*, or by the *Prince's* Nomination when at *Cambridge* or *Oxford*, than some Gentlemen I could mention who studied in foreign Countries, were regularly graduated, and are even licenc'd by the College at *London*?

3. Whether visiting Churches is incompatible with visiting Hospitals? Are well tim'd Acts of Devotion lawful Objections against the Qualifications of a Physician?

4. Where did he know Degrees confer'd on the Account of Orthodoxy, preferable to other Qualifications?

Page 64. He asks if we don't want a proper School for *Midmen* as well as for *Midwomen*? By which at least he intimates that *Midwomen* do; and now the *Plot* begins to open. But if *Men* want a proper School, as well as *Women*, how comes it that Mr. *Douglass* won't condescend to instruct them too? Why does he publish Proposals for *Midwomen* only. Page 75? Thereby excluding the poor unhappy *Men* from the Benefit of his Assistance. Surely the Reader will not be so unmannerly as to suppose, what he does in relation to the Physician-Midwives not consulting together, Page 52. and

and think that it is *the Fear of his discovering the Insignificancy of his pretended Lectures, or his own real Ignorance?* Utrum horum.

Upon my relating that a Woman had been twice or thrice deliver'd by a Man, of Children that always presented with the Head, which the Operator took a fatal Freedom with, *viz.* using the *Hook*, he asks, "How I could tell, who was not present, but that all these Children were *dead?*" So that in one Place he blames me for *not* finding fault with People where they deserve it, *Pag.* 58. and now he condemns me because I *do*, and endeavours to excuse the Person in a Fault, tho' he was *not present* himself, and consequently can know nothing of the Matter. Is this being consistent with himself, as he asks me, *Pag.* 5? So that to use his own Words, *Does he expect to fob the Reader off so* (*Page* 60.) *and must not he think him very weak and illiterate if he believ'd him?* A little farther he asks, "If a Man ought not to be very sure, before he accuses another after this Manner?" To apply which to himself, ought not he to have been sure of the Truth of what Dr. Chamberlen, Mr. Giffard, and myself had asserted, before he had accus'd us of condemning the Women, *guilty or not?* Who does he expect should inform him? Will the Women be ingenuous and honest enough to confess their own *Mal-Practice?* And how can he tell, who was *not present*, whether we have accus'd them *unjustly or not?* As for his
G thinking

thinking me to blame for not saying, whether this fatal Freedom-taker was a *Doctor* or an *Apothecary Midman*; probably I may be thought much more culpable, when I tell him that it was a *SURGEON Midman*; but as to the Truth of this Relation, I have all the Reason in the World to believe the Children were *living*, if Credit may be given to no less than *three* Matrons who were present at the several Labours, and all asserted the Fact. This indeed was that Person's constant practice to Children in that Case, *viz.* to fetch them with the *Hook*, whether *living* or *dead*.

In the same Page he excuses me in a great measure, tho' perhaps not intentionally, for having slipp'd the Mention of a Child's advancing with the *Buttocks* in my first Edition, by observing that Dr. *Nicholls* has omitted the it in the following remarkable Passage, *In omni malo situ, ut & in rebus desperatis, pedibus extrahetur Fœtus.* Compend. Anat. Now if Dr. *Nicholls*, whom he very justly styles *excellent*, has forgot to animadvert upon this Particular, surely I, who am so much his Inferior, may be excus'd the same.

Having thus, as he thinks, triumph'd over Dr. *Chamberlen*, Mr. *Giffard*, and myself, he proceeds to make what he calls *Deductions* from the Premises; and after expatiating upon the Havock that is oftentimes made among his Majesty's Subjects, by the Ignorance of *Mid-women*,

women, he asks, if calling of Names, such as rude, rough, negligent, ignorant, foolish, obstinate, &c. which we have so liberally bestow'd upon them, will make them more prudent or judicious, or enable them in any degree to give better Assistance themselves, and then replies in the Negative. Where Midwives are really rude, rough, negligent, obstinate, ignorant, &c. ought they not to be properly reprov'd and reprimanded for it? How will they otherwise know their Faults? Surely this open Treatment of them is a very improper Method of getting them all at our BECK, as he craftily insinuates; and I heartily agree with him, *Page 66*. That nothing can better deserve the Attention even of the *Legislature* itself. But how is the *Legislature* to be inform'd of the true State of their Practice, if we are not to have the honest Liberty of professing and asserting the Truth? Will the *Midwomen*, as he stiles them, come and accuse themselves, or is the *Legislature* to provide a Remedy for an Evil, of which they have no Knowledge or Information? The Verdict of the regularly instructed, experienc'd, and knowing Professors of this Art is likely to be much set by in the Eye of the *Legislature*, if Mr. *Douglass's* Opinion of them is to be of any Weight, who has unjustly and maliciously represented them as a Set of *designing, puzzling, crafty, covetous, hard-hearted, insolent, ignorant Nostrum-mongers*. Is this remedying the Evil he so loudly complains of, to deter our Wives and Daughters from regular Assistance, by his

G 2

calumnious

calumnious Insinuations, and make them fling themselves into the Hands of Women only, the Ignorance of whom he himself, a little after, confesses to be *undoubtedly* the *principal*, if not the *sole* Cause of these dire Events, (*Pag. 68.*) Is it *Charity* and *Humanity*, which he pretends so much to profess (*Pag. 66.*) that has induc'd him to this? *Surely no!* (*P. 66.*)

Page 67. and 68. he confesses, that our Wives and Children are cruelly massacred by ignorant Hands, and that Numbers have been and daily are destroyed by the Ignorance of Midwives. Have Writers in Midwifery then accus'd them unjustly, and haul'd them in by the Head and Shoulders, whether guilty or not?

*Page 66. He desires to know, "If these
" Gentlemen Complainants have propos'd any
" other Method, to prevent, for the future,
" this calamitous, this dismal, this inhuman
" Practice, except to send for one of them,
" upon every little trifling Difficulty?" Then
he proceeds, "Is not this making meer Nurses
" of the Midwomen, and ——— (Fools I suppose
he means) "of their Patients? Is it not
" telling them plainly, that they neither do,
" nor shall ever know any more of the Matter
" by any Information they will give them,
" than (what they knew before) just to receive
" a Child which drops into their Hands?"*

Lastly, he accuses us of making meer Jack-calls of them, to hunt about in Search of our Prey,

Prey, and then send for us to devour it (P. 67.) Now is not the very Reverse of all this true? Have not these Gentlemen Complainers, as he calls them, propos'd the best Methods to prevent this inhuman Practice? Do not they instruct them faithfully in their Writings, and endeavour to make *Midwives* instead of *Nurses* of them? Do they desire the Midwives to send for them upon every *little trifling* Difficulty? And are they not Cases of *real Difficulty* and *Danger* they desire to be call'd in upon? Does not he allow himself (Pag. 70.) that in many Cases *Instruments* are absolutely necessary, that they ought to send directly for a *Surgeon*, instead of fatiguing the Mother, and endangering both her and her Child, by needless Delays and fruitless Attempts. Are we to be blam'd then for informing them, in what Circumstances to send for us? Is it not rather our Duty to do it? Would he have Women Midwives only concern'd in Cases of Extremity? Is instructing them in the most approv'd Methods of Practice, and the Manner of turning Children with the greatest Safety, the same thing as telling them, *That they shall never know any more of the Matter, than they did before?* And is honestly exhorting them to send for superior Assistance, in order to save a Fellow Creature from an untimely Death, making them like *Jackalls* to hunt about for our Prey, and then send for us to devour it? Or rather must not he be besides himself, or at least think his

Readers

Readers so, to be gull'd by such notorious Falshoods?

But Page 70. *Surgeons* are directly to be sent for; why not such *Physicians* as practise this Art? Have not they as much Knowledge, Experience, Charity, and Integrity as the *Surgeons*? Are they not as capable of attaining to Perfection in *Manual Operations*, and of using proper Instruments with as much Judgment and Dexterity as the *Surgeons*? Why then must not they be concern'd too? But as Dr. *Baynard* says upon another Occasion, *Oh! Self, Self, what a selfish Thing art thou (a)!*

Pag. 68. He says that the Unskilfulness of Midwives, is owing to their want of a *Proper Education*, and not to their want of *Capacity*, and asserts, that it is more their *Misfortune* than their *Fault*. I think, in many respects, the contrary will hold good. For can it possibly be more their *Misfortune* than their *Fault*, that they have not got such Instruction as is in their Power, from *Books* that have been written for this Purpose? How many are there to be met with, that never give themselves the Trouble of perusing them for their Information? Is not this manifestly more their *Fault* than *Misfortune*, and owing rather to their Indolence, and good Opinion of their own

(a) Hist. of cold Bathing, Ed. 5. p. 268.

own Sufficiency, than a want of means for their Instruction?

Mr. *Douglafs* thinks (*Page 68.*) this fatal Distemper may be cur'd, and all its bad Consequences for the future avoided, if it was put in the Power of the *Midwomen* to qualify themselves thoroughly, and at a moderate Expence, in all the Parts of their most necessary Office, before they are permitted to practise. In order to attain this most desirable End, Mr. *Douglafs* proposes, First, the erecting an *Hospital* in *London* and *Westminster* (at the publick Expence, by *Donation* or *Subscriptions*, as several *Alms-houses*, *Infirmaries*, *Hospitals*, &c. of far less Consequence to the Common-wealth, have been, and are daily carried on) for the Reception of about two or three hundred poor Women who are big with Child. Secondly, That a proper Number of *Midwomen* be appointed to attend them. Thirdly, That two *SURGEONS Midmen* be appointed to assist these *Midwomen*, in all extraordinary Cases, and to demonstrate the Structure of the Parts concern'd; explaining the Art of touching, &c. in set Lectures, at least three Times a Week, to all the *Midwomen* and their Apprentices who please to attend. Fourthly, That every young Woman, who designs to practise Midwifery, be oblig'd to attend these Courses, during her Apprenticeship; then go and practise, for a set Time, under those expert Women in that *Hospital*; afterwards let them be examin'd, as to the Skill and Knowledge

Knowledge they have acquir'd in their Profession, by two *Surgeons*, and six or seven other Persons, appointed by his Majesty (because he does not think it reasonable that so many People's Bread should depend on the Humour and Caprice of any two Men only) and if approv'd, to receive from them a Certificate of their Fitness to practise in *London*, or any where else. Fifthly, That until fit *Hospitals* can be built and endow'd, a *Midman* be appointed in every City, or Country-town in *England*, to read the foresaid Lectures to all the *Midwomen* in the County, and demonstrate to them the Truth of their Doctrines on the Poor of the Neighbourhood, of which there are plenty every where.

I shall forbear making any Remarks upon this *Scheme*, lest Mr. *Douglafs* should put a bad Construction on it; and shall only observe, that I shall be as glad to see a proper *Hospital* erected, or any other Measures concerted for the Improvement of *Midwifery*, as himself, and shall be as ready to contribute any thing in my Power towards the Instruction of Midwives. 'Twas this Reason alone that induc'd me to write my *Essay on the Improvement of Midwifery*, wherein I have candidly inform'd them, according to the best of my Power. And can Mr. *Douglafs* be thought to have the real Interest of this Profession at his Heart, when he falls foul upon Dr. *Chamberlen*, Mr. *Giffard*, and myself, for endeavouring to improve it, and
because

because we reprimand the guilty and ignorant, and desire them to send for superior Advice in Cases of Extremity, and not sacrifice the Life of the Mother, or Child, and oftentimes both to their own Sufficiency? Does not he allow the Midwives himself to be oftentimes very ignorant (*Pag. 68.*)? And would not he have them instructed as before observ'd (*Pag. 70.*) in the Knowledge of those Cases where Instruments are absolutely necessary, that they may send directly for a SURGEON, &c. Now if there is many times a Necessity for calling in better Assistance, of which no Man in his Senses can doubt, why must we be so much blam'd for honestly enforcing the same Advice? Are we for this to be stigmatiz'd as People who *won't* instruct them, and represented as a Set of *crafty designing* Men, who had rather *puzzle and confound*, than *illustrate and improve* the Art we profess? Is it not a little surprising that Mr. Douglass should expect the Town to have any Opinion of his Probity, or take any notice of his *Scheme* or himself, who can be guilty of using others in such an unjust and scurrilous Manner. Tho', as I observ'd before, I should be glad to see any *Scheme* put in Execution for the real Good and Improvement of *Midwifery*, yet I cannot be so sanguine, in relation to Mr. Douglass's Proposal, as he himself seems to be, viz. That in very few Years there would hardly be an ignorant Midwoman in England, *Pag. 74.*

The Profession might certainly receive great Advantage; but to extirpate Ignorance, to that Degree, is a very hard Task indeed. When Mr. Douglass has perform'd this wonderful Feat, I would have him undertake to find out the *Longitude*, and *square the Circle*.

But Mr. Douglass having some Reason to doubt, whether the *Publick* would take any notice of this *Scheme* or not, has propos'd another Expedient in the Interim, and that is, to give a *Course of Midwifery* to Mid-woman only (for the Men it seems are to be depriv'd of this vast Advantage) wherein he promises that the principal Operations of that Art shall be briefly explained (Pag. ult.) And for their greater Encouragement assures them, that he is no less than the Goddess of Midwifery, and the only one that is able to instruct them.

*Dea sum Auxiliaris, openque
Exorata fero.*

Here Mr. Douglass has openly acknowledged himself to be but an *Old-woman*; which is the first modest Concession I have met with throughout his Book. How far that threatening *Paro-ecesis* in Pag. 68. viz. That they, who did not readily embrace the Opportunity, would not only be deservedly blam'd, but ought to be punish'd by the Civil Magistrate, may influence Women to come to those Lectures, I must leave.

ent

H

Those,

Those, who pretend to instruct others in any Art, ought, to be well vers'd in it themselves; and as Midwifery is a *Manual* Operation, so it cannot well be acquir'd but by a due Course of Practice. Whether Mr. *Douglafs* has been much conversant in this Profession, I will not take upon me to determine; tho', I confess, I never heard any Pretensions he had to *Midwifery* before he advertis'd the printing of his Book. Indeed he tells us in *Pag. 58.* *That he knew the Placenta once left behind*, which does not amount to any Proof of his practising himself, for he might know that by *Relation*, without ever having really exercis'd this Art. But in *Pag. 65.* he goes farther, and informs us, that he has found the *Scissura rimæ, ab Vulva ad Anum* by REPEATED EXPERIENCE, not to be at all dangerous, &c. which he might have experienc'd as a *Surgeon*, and not professedly as a *Man-Midwife*, it being commonly a *Surgeon's* Business, and for which Mr. *Douglafs* might frequently have been consulted. There is no other Passage to be met with in his whole Book, wherein he gives us the least Hint of his having practis'd himself. From whence I think we may fairly conclude, that Mr. *Douglafs* has but very lately taken up this Profession; otherwise surely he would not have omitted to have said something of his long *Practice* and *Experience*, in order to bespeak the more favourable Opinion of himself among the good Women. Before Mr. *Dou-*

glafs had made any Proposals for *Lectures* to the Town, he ought at least to have clear'd up this Doubt, *Whether or no he ever deliver'd a Woman in his Life.* If not, the Reader may judge how fit he is to take upon him the Instruction of others. He doubts not, P. 70. but the *Midmen* will object and say, *That the Midwomen want both Capacity and Strength (instruct them as you please) to perform what he proposes.* To which he immediately replies, "That this is only an artful and groundless
 " Insinuation, and affirms, *ore rotundo, plenis*
 " *buccis* (as he chuses to express himself) that
 " it is not want of Capacity, Docility, Strength,
 " or Activity, but meerly want of fit and full
 " Instructions in all the Parts of their Office,
 " which disables them to perform it in all
 " Cases (excepting where Instruments are
 " necessary) with as much Ease, Safety, and
 " Expedition, as the most dextrous *Midman*,
 " &c." Must not this Gentleman be in great
 Want of Matter to shew his Abilities upon, to haul in the *Midmen* making an Objection they probably never so much as thought of? Before he had proceeded to this, he ought first to have told us, *ore rotundo, plenis buccis*, as he affects to write, who ever doubted of the Womens want of Docility, Strength, &c. Nor do I see what this Observation was brought in upon, unless it was for the Sake of this paultry Scrap of *Latin*, that the Women might take him for a great *Scholliard*, and admire his profound Knowledge in that learned Language, like

like *Scrub* in the Play, who affirms, "That tho' he does not understand *Latin*, yet he thinks there's something very pretty in the Sound of it." As to their Want of fit Instructions in their Profession, I have before observ'd, that they have more Opportunities of Information from *Books* that have from Time to Time been printed for the Improvement of the Art of Midwifery, than many of them thro' Indolence and Self-sufficiency ever made use of; as is very plain from their running counter in Practice to the Rules there laid down. And I am much deceiv'd, if they may not meet with as much or more Information, from *Books*, for the Value of three or four *Shillings*, as they will from *Lectures* of so many *Guineas*. Besides, the great Probability of what they hear in *Lectures* slipping out of their Memory, whilst a *Book* is always at Hand, and ready to give them constant and repeated Instruction, if they will but be at the Trouble of consulting it.

Pag. 73. He asks, if all Ages have not produc'd Women, who have made a Figure in the most sublime Parts of Learning, and in all Manner of curious and useful Arts? (But what Necessity for this Query? Who ever doubted it?) and then subjoins, and also illiterate, thick-headed *Priests*, *Lawyers*, and *Physicians*? But what have the *Lawyers* and *Priests* done to disoblige Mr. *Douglafs*, that they must be haul'd in too, by the *Head* and *Shoulders*, in a *Book* of *Midwifery*? But all it seems must feel his *critical Lash*;

He

He hints, *Pag. 73.* That at the Time of Delivery it is least proper for Men to come near the Women; forgetting that but a few Pages before (*Pag. 67.*) he blames the Women as obstinate and unreasonably modest, for not being willing to admit a *Midman*. But great *Wits*, they say, have short Memories.

But to draw towards a Conclusion; what is all that Mr. *Douglas* has said, in relation to myself? What has he detected in me that is *wrong*? Or what has he advanc'd from the Writings of his *Old-Woman* which I have not?

As to informing Midwives, and directing them when to call in superior Assistance, what have I left unsaid? Or what Direction can be farther given them? Some of the chief of the Profession, of my own Sex, have told me I have been too *open*; so that I'm found fault with on both Sides. But this gives me no Uneasiness. I have a Satisfaction in doing what I judg'd to be my *Duty*, and acting the Part of an honest Man which my Enemies can never be able to rob me of. My Way is to walk in the Path which Providence has put me in, as inoffensively as possibly I can; ever to give the Wall to my *Superiors*, and never to jostle my *Inferiors* into the Kennel, or to affront any Person. But if a *BULLY* draws upon me, I never fly, but defend myself, with proper Force.

I never said or did any thing to deserve this mighty Man's Displeasure; and yet spur'd on by an envious, jealous Fury he has attack'd me: But alas, his Arm is too weak, and his *Thrusts* are easily *parried*; not to mention that by too much Heat he has over LUNGED.

Having now laid the whole of Mr. Douglass's Objections before the Reader, I will not suppose that his main Drift, after all his FUGS and SPLUTTER about the Reformation of Midwifery, was purely to set himself up, as the only Dictator in this Profession, and to inform the good Women that he was better able to give them *Lectures* than any Body else. I shall pass over the artful Methods he has made use of to insinuate himself into publick Favour, by running down and discommending every body else. It seems they are all a Set of *puzzling, designing Men*, rather *confounding and darkening*, than *illuminating* their Profession. But Mr. Douglass has no Design; his *Candour, Modesty*, and *good Usage* of all he speaks of, will not so much as admit of any such Suspicion. To be sure he had no View of throwing a Cloud of Infamy and Ignorance over his *Neighbour's* Character, that his own might appear to the better Advantage. The *Tenderness*, he shews for other People's Reputation, cannot fail of endearing him to the Town, and making every body as tender of him. I will not so much as mention

mention what perhaps some People may say, that the Motto in the Front of his Book ought to be inverted, and read, *non aliis, sed sibi.* But the *Justice* and *Impartiality* of this Author are of all his good Qualities the most extraordinary, nor can the Reader well pass over the following remarkable Instances of them. There is for Example, plain Dr. Hody, and the ingenious and experienc'd Mr. Will. Giffard, Surgeon, Pag. 52. the disingenious (Pag. 53.) stupid (Pag. 54.) and absurd (Pag. 55.) Dr. Maubray, and the just, tart, reverend, and learned Dr. MITCHELL *Utriusque Medicinæ Doctor* (Pag. 59.) The puzzling, confounding, artful, insinuating, darkening (Pag. 3.) perverting, interested, teasing, threatening (Pag. 5.) Cobweb-spinning, blushing (Pag. 9.) magisterial, dictatorial (P. 13.) fulsom, nauseous (Pag. 14.) sneering, insolent (Pag. 21.) imperious (Pag. 22.) NOSTRUM-MONGER (Pag. 4, 12, and 24.) Dr. Chamberlen, and that accurate Anatomist, and consummate Accoucher (his own Brother) Dr. James Douglass.

The to be serious on this Head, I cannot think his worthy Brother has any Reason to thank him for such a fulsom Compliment. The truly learned are always modest, and a Gentleman, of Dr. James Douglass's well known Merit and Abilities, can never stand in need of a such a poultry Puff as this. as Mr. Douglass has gone long with this wondrous Birth, the first Account we had of

of this Gentleman's *Pregnancy*, was several Months before he was deliver'd, which at Length, on the 29th of *April* 1736, we had Notice of. Some think it a *monstrous*, others an *abortive* Birth; all agree, that it was not come to its *full Perfection*. But be that as it will, the *Mountain* was long in Labour, and at length, like that in the *Fable*, brought forth a Mouse.

Before I take my leave, I cannot but observe, that this Book is printed for, and sold only by, the *Author* in *Lad-Lane*, near *Guild-Hall*, at the Price of Two Shillings, tho' it contains but 75 Pages, and that in a loose Print; which is only double the usual Price of Pamphlets of that Size. Indeed such a Production, as this, does not happen often; and it is but fitting, that an *extraordinary Performance* should be bought at an *extraordinary Price*. Which brings to my Mind a remarkable Observation I remember to have read in the *Grub-street Journal* of May 1. 1735, in relation to Mr. *Douglass's* Proposals for a new Osteology tack'd to his trifling Remarks, on a Piece upon the same Subject, by an ingenious Author (to whom I am well inform'd Mr. *Douglass* lay under the highest Obligations) viz. that he was much displeased with him for making Twenty *per Cent.* of his Money, because he had enter'd into the same Design, with a View of getting Five and Twenty himself, baiting and worrying him with all

I

the



2 1 W 1 7

the Boisterousness of Pedantry and Rusticity, at the same Time that he exposes his own Nakedness.

Thus far I have persuaded myself to proceed in my Remarks on Mr. *Douglass's* trifling and malicious Cavils; nor would I have him think, because he came off unanswer'd in his paultry Attempt to depreciate that valuable Work (the Author not thinking it worth his while to give him an Answer) that therefore he is always to escape with Impunity.

Mr. *Douglass* seems to be in haste to dispose of the present Edition of his Book, probably because he has some fresh Observations to oblige the Town with in a future Edition of that elaborate Work.

But lest he should imagine me ready, to answer any farther, such false and dirty Aspersions as he may think fit to fling upon me, I here assure him, once for all, that I have Affairs of much more Consequence to mind, nor can I give him a better general Answer, than what I am told the aforesaid Gentleman sent him; when being ask'd by an Acquaintance of Mr. *Douglass*, if he would not give a Reply, he coolly answer'd, *Whenever I have as little Business, or as much Malice as himself, I will set about it.*

F I N I S.

Advertisement.

WHilst my Papers were in the Press, I happen'd to meet with a small Book, intituled, *THE MIDWIFE RIGHTLY INSTRUCTED, &c.* by J. DAWKES, *Surgeon*; in which the Author has treated me in so Gentleman-like a Manner, and (wholly different from Mr. *Douglass*) quoted me so fairly and honestly, in the main, that I am sorry, I am oblig'd, in Justice to myself, to take notice of a great Mistake he made, in reading one Part of my Treatise, and giving it in quite different Words than I had made use of, viz. in *Pag. 84.* he says, " Let
 " any one consider the Difficulty that must
 " attend the getting down the Arms; in
 " doing which, according to Mr. *Chapman's*
 " Advice, both the Hands must be at the
 " same Time (as well as the Child's Body) in
 " the VAGINA, from which the Woman must
 " necessarily suffer an additional Pain, &c."

My Words are these, *Pag. 27.* of my first Edition, and *Pag. 44.* of my second Edition,

viz.

